



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0503MI-1 for Clintondale Community Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Essentially, this is a proposal to take the high-school's school-wide flipped classroom model, which has a proven success rate, and scale it up to include the elementary and middle schools that feed into the high school. The proposal mostly provides a comprehensive and coherent vision of how it will implement this reform. It illustrates its vision with anecdotes and success stories from the high school, which both clarifies what their reforms will look like and adds to the credibility of their proposal. In addition, extensive research citations and articles in the appendix that describe the high school's success with its flipped model further enhance the proposal's credibility. The vision statement clearly describes how the LEA's high school's flipped model has accelerated student achievement, deepened student learning, and increased equity through improved access to information, personalizing student support, and improving the use of both class time and homework time. Moreover, the vision statement shows how the district could continue to improve on this model and could use it with its other schools if it had access to hardware and software that would support its vision.</p> <p>It's a concern that the LEA proposes trying the flipped model with its elementary schools, but has not piloted these techniques at any elementary schools. It also cites little research about flipped models in elementary schools, and its plans for implementing the model in elementary schools aren't as detailed.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal consistently presents a clear and detailed plan for implementing its district-wide flipped classroom reform. It describes how it will use technology such as tablets and/or laptops to implement a flipped model which will a) provide direct instruction in the form of vodcasts and other methods of providing content outside of class, b) personalize learning by using individualized student data to support collaborative practices of teacher teams, 3) implement formative assessments which are closely monitored by teachers and which are accessible to administrators, parents, students, and teachers, and 4) Use class time to provide motivating instruction that promotes high engagement and deep learning. Other sections of the proposal provide even more specific goals and timelines for meeting those goals [a].</p> <p>The proposal will apply to all students at all schools in the district; the population is enumerated in Table A(2) [b, c].</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application presents a detailed, high-quality plan that is centered on specific goals and specific methods for achieving those goals. It presents clear outcome goals and steps and timelines for meeting those goals. Moreover, it supports each goal with well-known research that explains the district's theory of change and how its plan will improve student learning outcomes.</p> <p>Their high school already has a history of sharing its flipped school model via YouTube, articles, and online so that other schools can follow their model if they choose to do so. The proposal is centered around scaling up its model to the middle school and elementary schools that feed into the high school.</p> <p>There was less detail about how the applicant plans to adapt the flipped classroom model to middle, intermediate, and primary grade students.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section is extensive and detailed. It provides performance on numerous summative assessments, and highlights the differences between the relatively stable scores among the elementary and middle school students, as compared to double-digit gains among the high school students (whose school had begun employing the flipped model). This provided strong evidence that the applicant's vision would be likely to result in improved student learning and performance [a].

The highlighted high school scores also demonstrated decreasing achievement gaps, with sometimes double-digit score improvements among African-American and Economically Disadvantaged students, and with particularly high rates of growth among students with disabilities. This provided strong evidence that the applicant's vision would be likely to increase equity and access to tools for educational success [c].

In addition, the applicant demonstrated an increase in their graduation rate (from 82.97% to 90.65%) since the high school had "flipped" its curriculum. This data was not aggregated into separate subgroups [c].

The applicant also demonstrated a 5% increase in college enrollment rates since the high school had "flipped" [d].

The district provides ambitious yet achievable goals for each area described above.

Moreover, the applicant provides multiple examples in this and other sections of specific ways that its vision is likely to result in improved student learning and increased equity. The proposal provides examples of ways that a flipped curriculum can increase equity by providing students with more opportunities and methods for accessing the curricula, and with opportunities to hear, view, or read course content several times and to also focus selectively on the areas where they need the most help. In addition, this model allows teachers to spend less time presenting basic information and more time helping students critically engage with the content and get help where they have problems, which is what the school found their less advantaged students needed most. Finally, the proposal provided additional data supporting improved performance and increased equity by reporting that the number of discipline incidents dropped from 731 to 187, and that the number of parent complaint calls dropped from 200-300 to 7 [optional].

Access to multiple forms of curriculum delivery, increased and improved learning opportunities, and the improved student performance that is already being shown could increase the likelihood of increased postsecondary degree attainment [e].

Most of the data presented is for secondary students. There is less evidence that the LEA's proposal will transfer well to the LEA's elementary students.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA serves a student population that has met considerable economic and family challenges; the high school was identified as a Persistently Low Performing School, ranking in the lowest 5% of high schools in Michigan in 2009-2010. A state waiver allowed the principal to remain and attempt some new reforms, and there is evidence from the previous two years that these reforms are beginning to work. The high school assessed what factors were inhibiting the efficient uses of time during class, and what factors were preventing students from doing their homework outside of class; it then adopted the flipped model as a means of addressing these issues.

The LEA provides descriptions, charts, and other statistical evidence of both the need and potential for growth among students throughout the district. Data from the high school from the past two years demonstrates success over the past years. This data stands in contrast to the more stagnant scores of the elementary and middle schools, which have not made changes to their curricula or delivery methods. While this is not a clear record of success in the past four years, the proposal does show the potential of the reforms initiated by the high school to improve student learning outcomes, close achievement gaps, raise graduation rates, and raise college enrollment [a].

The reforms described above are ambitious and significant, and the proposal demonstrates their potential to impact their most persistently low-achieving students in schools that have been low-achieving in the state [b].

The LEA's flipped classroom model would provide an excellent vehicle for making student performance data available to

students, educators, parents, and other stakeholders, and the LEA has detailed plans and timelines for doing this [c].

The score was reduced because, although the records and descriptions were clear and extensive, the record of success only was for two years and only was for the high school. The proposal is designed to address the static and relatively poor performance at the other schools and in previous years at the high school.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All financing information stipulated in a-d are included on the district's website, which also has a form for requesting additional information.

The district has used its transparency process to work with the state and other stakeholders after it was designated as a Persistently Lowest Achieving School. They used this designation as a catalyst to explore and adopt the "flipped schools" model. They have continued to maintain transparency by hosting a visit with their State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and by publicizing their methods and process in articles and online.

The LEA has provided clear and detailed information demonstrating that it is providing all data stipulated by criteria a-d.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has not only met the conditions for sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements, but has taken additional steps to implement a personalized learning environment for students and to work with representatives of the state and district throughout this process. It has had the state superintendent visit the school, and has also publicized its efforts in both online and newspaper articles.

The district has given the schools involved in this LEA sufficient autonomy to impement the reforms in this proposal.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a) The need for the reform at the high school level was identified after the principal conducted exit interviews with 1500 parents and graduating seniors. The flipped model was then piloted by a teacher in the high school before it was adopted by other teachers in the school. Teachers at the middle, elementary, and even pre-K feeder schools have since expressed interest in adopting the flipped model. The appendix contains letters of support from teachers, the media, and businesses. Parents responded positively to the flipped model at the high school and were interested in having the same opportunities for younger children.

a i & ii) Apart from a letter signed by two teachers, there is no evidence of collective bargaining representation, or evidence of support from at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools.

b) There are letters of support from a few teachers, from the Clintondale Education Association, and there are extensive examples of media support.

The high school's reforms seemed to be driven by a particularly strong, inventive, driven, and dynamic administrator. But it wasn't always clear to what extent the other schools and teachers were invested in the flipped classroom plan, or how well the reforms would be implemented without such strong leadership from that one administrator.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The application presents both a detailed narrative and a chart listing the needs/gaps, proposed solution, timeline for implementation, and party responsible for the implementation. These act in conjunction to show why the RTTT grant is necessary to improve student achievement in the district and how the district will use the funding to implement a flipped school model in order to address identified achievement gaps and obstacles faced by students.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application emphasizes that one of the benefits of the flipped model is that it gives students more ownership of and control over their learning. Students have access to the information they need when they need it, and as such they can use their learning to accomplish their goals [a i]. The flipped model also allows flexibility for students to explore individual academic and career interests, and allows educators to include vodcasts and other online materials from citizens who work in various careers, and to representatives of diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives [a ii, a iv, b iii]. The high school has already started to find that allowing students to access presentations of content outside of class is creating more opportunities for teachers to focus on deep learning experiences and individualized instruction when the students are in the classroom [a iii]. They are finding that the flipped model also allows teachers to spend more time on helping students get help with mastering critical academic content. It is also helping teachers focus on providing students with opportunities to work in teams and to focus on sharing information and solving problems [a v].</p> <p>The application describes numerous strategies for personalizing the content and pace of instruction, and for diversifying instructional approaches and extending the learning environment to 24-7 opportunities that can occur anywhere a student has a smartphone or access to the internet [b i, b ii]. In addition, the application includes plans to integrate the implementation of the flipped model with faculty development around the implementation of the newly-adopted common core standards [b iii].</p> <p>The flipped strategy will also implement its increased wireless access and use of tablets and/or laptops to help teachers more frequently assess students' progress, and to communicate students' progress to the students, parents, and administrators. It doesn't describe what program will be used to do this [iv A]. The applicants envision that they can also use the flipped model to personalize learning recommendations for students by adjusting their reading assignments or other content. The classroom emphasis on deep engagement, problem solving, and teamwork, rather than on teachers' presenting information, will provide additional time to support individual students [iv B]. It will also allow students with special needs to have increased access to assistive technology [v].</p> <p>There is a specific timeline for providing training and support to teachers as they adopt flipped classroom techniques. The district has already produced more than 100 training vodcasts as its first step toward supporting students, parents, and teachers in using the tools necessary for flipped classrooms [c].</p> <p>There is not extensive evidence of how well the flipped classroom model will meet the developmental needs of students in different age groups, particularly for elementary school students.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) The application provides both a narrative describing their plans to train and support teachers and a chart detailing their training goals, timeline, responsible party, and practices the teacher should "deliver" at that time. As described in previous sections, the flipped model will help the district's K-12 teachers implement personalized learning environments [a i], adapt content and instruction to individual students' needs [a ii], and frequently measure student progress via both formative and summative assessments aligned with Common Core standards and students' career readiness goals [a iii].</p> <p>While 96% of the district's teachers are currently rated "highly effective" under their district's evaluation system, the district is piloting what they hope will be a more nuanced assessment that will include a value-added model that includes a pre- and post-test, and that will meet the requirements for teaching students with disabilities. The application also emphasizes that a flipped school model can allow students to have access to more than one "teacher" and more than one form of instruction. This can create opportunities for students to learn from the person who is best able to present a specific type of information, and it can allow teachers to focus more on working with students and meeting their individual needs [a iv].</p> <p>b) The district has already created training modules in the form of vodcasts to help teachers learn to use the technologies necessary for flipping their classroom. In addition, they have a detailed plan to provide training, opportunities to collaborate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and to both support teachers and ensure that they are able to meet implementation goals. The "FLIP Plan for Principal and Teacher Continuous Improvement" details how and when the district will provide actionable information, learning resources, tools to create and share new resources, and processes and tools to</p>		

match student needs" [b i, ii, & iii].

c) The high school principal is a pioneer in the flipped school model, as evidenced by the numerous articles in the appendix. There are clear plans to involve all principals in both training and collaboration. The application emphasizes that the principals will focus on supporting and empowering teachers to find the best ways to use the new technologies and flipped classroom model to best meet the needs of their students. As discussed above, the district is piloting a more nuanced teacher evaluation program. Its "FLIP Plan for Principal and Teacher Continuous Improvement" also details "deliverables," which are goals specific to implementing the reform (c i). Teacher training and PLC collaboration will also focus on using the new technologies and flipped schools model to individualize instruction, increase student performance, and close achievement gaps, particularly among economically disadvantaged and special needs students [c ii].

d) The applicant has described how the flipped schools model can allow students to receive instruction from the most qualified individuals by expanding students' access to a much broader network of presenters. While the district is piloting a new assessment and therefore is in the process of re-evaluating who is "highly-qualified," its emphasis seems to be on supporting all teachers' process of "continuous improvement". The district has plans in place to monitor teachers in their efforts.

There could be a more extensive plan for providing training on developmentally-appropriate flipped classroom strategies to elementary school teachers. There could also be a more detailed plan for ensuring equal involvement and leadership from the LEA's elementary and middle school principals and faculty.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has detailed plans to hire a Director of Flipped Learning, and to also employ a Director of Technology, teacher mentors, technology specialists, and training vocasts too provide support services to all participating schools. In addition, it plans to install technical infrastructure such as a Learning Management System (LMS) that will be make district content management more uniform, and hardware improvements such as consistent wireless access, uniform hardware (tablets and/or laptops), and remodeled classrooms that provide more collaborative and flexible student workspaces [a]. It plans to use these to support schools as they change to the flipped school model, but also recognizes the need to provide enough autonomy to allow each school and teacher to determine how to best meet their students' needs [b].</p> <p>The applicant plans to use the flipped schools model to help teachers use weekly diagnostic assessments to measure student mastery and tailor instruction to students' learning needs. It is unclear whether this will fully allow students to earn credit based on mastery alone, but it is clear that this model will allow the district to take steps in this direction, and that it will allow students multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times, in multiple ways, and in multiple formats [c & d]. As described in previous sections, the flipped model will also provide opportunities for assistive technology and for adaptation for students with disabilities. The applicant cites Marzano's research to demonstrate that it will also provide content area vocabulary instruction and multiple practice opportunities, both of which can be particularly helpful for English learners [e.]</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Much of the applicant's grant money will go toward ensuring that all students in all of their schools (and their parents, teachers, and administrators) have access to the tools that will allow for the delivery of content through a flipped instructional model. The school has piloted this via high school students' smartphones, home internet access, and access to computers at school. But without the grant they cannot fully ensure that all students have access to the resources necessary for true implementation of a flipped schools model [a].</p> <p>The application has detailed that it will use trainings and vodcasts to ensure that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support. It doesn't provide much information about how it will troubleshoot and maintain the tablets and/or laptops it provides to teachers and students, and how it will provide for their continuing maintenance [b]. It doesn't provide as much information about how it will train middle and elementary school teachers in developmentally-appropriate flipped classroom strategies. It also isn't as clear how it will ensure coordination and buy-in from teachers at all of its member schools, or how it will ensure that the infrastructure meets the needs of teachers and schools that serve different grade levels.</p> <p>The applicant further plans to use the grant money to install a district-wide LMS and to provide programs and technology</p>		

systems that are inter operable throughout the district. This will allow parents, students, teachers, and administrators more consistent opportunities to export and view information [c, d].

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant plans to have teachers assess their progress toward implementation goals and students' performance data on a weekly basis. It already has PLC structures in place that would allow it to begin doing this. It also has plans to use educator evaluation systems based on student growth measures.</p> <p>The applicant has both detailed growth goals for performance measures, and detailed timelines to implement and assess its flipped school reforms. These detailed goals and timelines, combined with their plans to institute weekly assessments of their implementations, create an effective strategy for implementing rigorous continuous improvement, providing regular and timely feedback toward project goals, and for making ongoing corrections as needs arise. The strategy thoroughly addresses how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the efficacy of the RTTT investments.</p> <p>The proposal could include more information on allowing for and responding to continuous formal and informal feedback from teachers and students.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has numerous PLC, school, district, and community structures in place to enable ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The proposal includes detailed plans to monitor progress in the form of surveys, evaluation forms, observations, teacher feedback, quantitative and qualitative data from teachers and students, and even celebrations of success. It has provided a timeline describing evaluative team structures and functions, meeting frequency, and team leaders and members.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided multiple growth targets for students in all of the applicable population categories. They included measures such as discipline incidents, absences, college and career readiness measures, in addition to performance on tests such as the Michigan Literacy Progress Proficiency. a, b, & c are implied but not explicitly described or explained.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Plans to evaluate the effectiveness of RTTT-funded activities were described thoroughly.</p> <p>The applicant has numerous PLC, school, district, and community structures in place to enable ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The proposal includes detailed plans to monitor progress in the form of surveys, evaluation forms, observations, teacher feedback, quantitative and qualitative data from teachers and students, and even celebrations of success. It has provided a timeline describing evaluative team structures and functions, meeting frequency, and team leaders and members. It has a clear and high-quality approach to continuously evaluate and improve its plans.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget includes funds from other sources, including both district educational funds and private donors [a, c i]. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the proposal to implement a flipped schools model throughout the district. It includes details such as stipends for teachers who assist in training other teachers. Each item is defined and explained [b]. It identifies which funds will be needed for one-time investments versus ongoing funding that will be needed during and past the proposed 4-year budget [c ii].

Since the flipped classroom is such a new and model that would require a radical change from all teachers in terms of content delivery, management, and structuring of the school day, the LEA may need to budget even more for professional development.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant thoroughly describes the partnerships it has already developed. It supplies a chart that details areas where it will need continued funding, what grant funding they already have, and possible funding sources for grants they need. The budget projects expenses for four years. It isn't completely clear how the applicant will continue to supply laptops and/or tablets for each student and teacher after this the RTTT grant expires-- those seem likely to wear out after 3-4 years. The LEA also needs to ensure that it budgets for continuous technical support at each site.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1) The applicant provides an impressive list of community partnerships. The list includes school-based health centers operated by a local Health Investment Corporation that provides a variety of wellness, medical assistance and medical education programs in several district schools. The applicant also describes a tutoring program it operates with a local university, and partnerships from several tech companies that have helped it pilot the flipped school model in its high school.

2) The applicant lists five desired outcomes from its partnerships. The results span from improved health and decreased absences, access to medical help and information, 24/7 opportunities to contact college students and "consider life beyond high school," helping students see the relevance of what they are learning to future workplaces, and supporting teachers with implementation of the FLIP model.

3) The applicant provides a chart that tracks how these partnerships will lead to improvements in their selected performance measures [3 a]. In a narrative form, it explains how it will improve results for participating students [3 b] and use additional partners to scale the model and improve results over time [3 c].

4) For each type of partnership, the applicant describes how the partnership would integrate education and other services in order to improve students' learning outcomes.

5) It describes how its partnerships would help the schools assess the health needs and educational needs of students [5 a], identify and address the technology needs of its schools [5 b] and how the technology partnerships have assessed with staff capacity building and the improvement of educational services [5 c and 5 e].

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The entire proposal centers around personalizing learning environments by using a flipped model in all of the schools in the

LEA. The flipped model would allow students to access course content at any place, any time, and as many times as desired. It would further allow students, teachers, and parents to further personalized learning environments by allowing students to access a greater variety of information, materials, instructors, and learning modalities. As such, they would provide increased opportunities for students to learn a greater variety of college and career skills that are aligned with each student's individual interests. The LEA is already finding that the flipped model in the high school is expanding students' access to a greater variety of the most effective educators, is decreasing achievement gaps by equalizing access, and is increasing the rates of high school graduation.

Total	210	180
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

- 1) The optional budget supplement proposes to expand the flipped school model beyond the district by 1) establishing a training center and national model for pre-K -12 flipped learning and 2) creating a LMS that supports pre-K-12 flipped learning. It cites the numerous examples of national media attention and anecdotal evidence of other schools' attempts to replicate the model as evidence for this need. The applicant would use the additional funding to help schools facing their original predicament of "dismal scores and no funding" by sharing its library of vodcasts, sharing their progress and implementation plans, opening their school as an observation site, sending mentors to assist other schools, and developing a training center for flipped learning. As such, the specific area or population the applicant would address would be other schools, perhaps with similar populations and similar challenges, that would be interested in pursuing a flipped school model if they had the resources to begin the process. As such, the applicant provides a clear rationale for using the increase budget to expand the reach and impacts of the reforms it will try in its school.
- 3) The applicant presents a detailed plan and budget for implementing its reforms. Its plan will help schools facing similar challenges implement the strategies that are starting to benefit its high school students.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0503MI-2 for Clintondale Community Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Clintondale Community Schools (CCS) presents a vision of expanding to all schools and grades in the CCS LEA an effort based on the creative concept of "flipped instructional delivery" that is being implemented currently in Clintondale High School (CHS), where 68-82% of students are identified as at risk for school failure and the school ranked among the lowest 5% of high schools in Michigan in 2009-2010. CCS states the "vision is for Clintondale Community Schools to become the Nation's first 'Flipped district'." The model, developed and advanced at CHS by the school leader and his team, shifts instructional delivery and learning opportunities from a traditional process in which students receive instruction and content information in their classrooms to the delivery of content via technology and/or material for students to review first outside of class to follow-up classroom activities designed to process information with teachers and peers.

The effort at CHS has demonstrated promising results in improving student engagement and achievement. While CCS and outside observers have reason for encouragement, the reform is still young, continues to be grounded, and has sparse research evidence. The review provided by the State notes several area of alignment with State goals to improve learning and performance.

The vision and proposal focus primarily on the model and on applying it broadly, not as much on student learning and outcomes or the development of more effective and highly effective teachers. The vision touches generally on the four core educational assurance areas by highlighting the initiative's relevant goals and strategies that comport with the assurance areas. The proposal does not address specifically the project's components in relation to the assurance areas and the work to date that informs the effort going forward.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)

10

7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCS provides an incomplete picture of the its approach to implementing expansion of the personalized "flipped" instructional delivery approach to all schools and students in the Clintondale Community Schools district. CCS is clear in the scope of its expansion -- the four additional schools in the LEA and all grade levels. CCS notes that the district has a total enrollment of 2004 in grades pre-K to 12 in three elementary schools, one middle school and one high school. All students will be considered participating students of whom 1504 (75%) are from low-income families.

CCS provides a list of the schools, and numbers of participating students, participating high needs students, and participating educators.

The district plans for all students in all schools to participate. The plan does not make clear how and when students in all grades specifically will be included as participating students. The proposal narrative includes Pre-K, but the Roll Out timeline only includes reference to K-12. CCS does indicate broadly that the elementary schools will phase in the initiative by content, starting with Math first because that is the subject area of greatest concern.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CCS provides an incomplete plan to accomplish LEA-wide reform and change.

Little research evidence exists on the "flipped instructional delivery" model, but some of its underpinnings (e.g., higher student interest and engagement with personalized and differentiated instruction; positive impact of having effective teachers; value of parental involvement) have research support that CCS cites.

CCS has designated all schools and students in the district to participate in the initiative and acknowledges that the initiative will "look different in different grade bands." CCS doesn't go on to explain or suggest how, and what the impact of differing circumstances and different learning by grade might mean both on using the approach in the various grades (with students at different ages and stages of development) and on assessing project outcomes.

CCS notes that the initiative will be phased in the elementary schools starting with a Math focus, but the CCS Roll Out timeline does not present a clear picture of the systematic rollout of content or features across grades or schools.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CCS does not provide sufficient information to support the varied trajectory of improved student learning and performance.

The application provides information only in tables that show projections of increasing student progress and achievement by grade and subgroup. CCS bases projections on results on the State English/Language Arts and Math tests beginning with students in grade 3, and each subsequent grade through grade 8 and on the relevant State high school English and Math assessments for high school students. Stand-alone tables also present data showing a decrease in achievement gaps, an increase in high school graduation rates. CCS does not have a narrative discussion of the projections or reasons for growth patterns displayed. It also is not clear what is expected/projected for students in the earliest grades.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CCS does not demonstrate a record of success for the past four years. The "flipped instructional delivery" effort has only been operational and able to allow some assessment since 2010-2011. A record over a longer period is warranted.</p> <p>Clintondale High School's focus on transforming the school that had been identified as Persistently Low Performing school and whose students experienced great difficulty in connecting with their instruction and completing assignments, led to a reflective and creative process by school leaders and staff resulting in the development of the program. The application notes relevant education research that supports key program directions and areas of emphasis.</p> <p>For one year CCS shows sharp reduction in the grade 9 student failure rate in core courses, large gains (from 10.5% to 17.4%) in rates of proficiency achieved by high school students on the Michigan Merit Exam in English overall and for all subgroups, and positive direction posted overall in Math but no progress for African American or Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. Increase in graduation rates, and reductions in discipline incidents and parent complaints also were cited. One year of data, though significant, is not sufficient to meet the competition requirement.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCS provides a minimal response, citing that it complies with the Freedom of Information Act and that the CCS website "gives information on how all stakeholders may obtain information" in the categories requested. There is no discussion on whether other information-sharing vehicles exist, how parents and other stakeholders are made aware of the website resource or if training might be needed or provided to help students, parents and other stakeholders access.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	3
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>At least one school in the CCS LEA, Clintondale HS, the initiative's home site, has not operated with full autonomy. After Clintondale High School was placed on the list of Persistently Low Performing schools, it received a waiver from the State to keep its leadership and implement the "flipped instructional delivery" model to transform and turnaround the school. CCS does not describe the current status and any requirements that exist under the waiver.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CCS district details clearly how it asked for and received stakeholder input from students, parents and teachers that informed the development of the model, reviewed it as it was piloted and helped inform broader implementation. The application does not contain sufficient evidence of support from all stakeholders.</p> <p>The principal interviewed over 1,500 parents and graduating seniors over nine years and they revealed an array of issues that disrupted attendance and impeded students' learning at home. Because many students had access to cell phones and e-mail retrieval, "flipping" instruction gained support and was then piloted in one class that was chosen because of its population of students who had a record of low achievement. The pilot resulted in the class increasing its rate of engagement and homework completion to near 100%, and in reducing to zero the number of students who failed the course. By contrast, the traditional delivery classroom saw 13% of its students earn a failing grade.</p> <p>Students who participated indicated their preference for vodcasts rather than traditional assignments, suggesting increased student interest and willingness to share perspectives and improved overall engagement.</p> <p>Parents reportedly were better informed as well, remarking that they had a "better idea of what their child was learning ...[T]his</p>		

allowed them to initiate meaningful discussion with their teen while driving or having a meal together." CCS notes that parents can use these opportunities to support students in what they are doing and learning

CCS cites the interest expressed by middle school teachers, who looked forward to the web-based intervention tools to support differentiated instruction for range of students they teach.

CCS provides extensive support of the interest that the media has generated and provides examples of coverage in venues ranging from small print vehicles to national TV.

A District Advisory Committee will include bring together quarterly representatives of "parents, leaders, teachers, students (high school), and the community to monitor progress and compare growth with performance targets." Each school will have an Advisory Committee with similar representation.

The proposal includes letters of support from elementary school teachers, the President of the Teachers Union, and numerous articles about the program. The State Education agency provided an overall positive and constructive review of the proposal, and local government leaders received opportunity to comment. Evidence of specific support from the school board, business and other community stakeholders for this specific effort is not provided.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

CCS presents an insufficiently detailed plan to systematically assess and analyze current status, needs and gaps, and proposed solutions to effect personalized learning environment.

CCS provides what it calls a "summary analysis" of needs and gaps in areas of educator readiness, technology readiness, curricular readiness and classroom readiness. It follows with an outline of a combination of approaches and activities to respond, a timeline for execution and responsible parties. It is unclear how these particular needs and gaps have been assessed and are being reviewed on an ongoing basis. With respect to technology and what students might need to personally engage and direct their learning, CCS does not discuss what is already known about a student's ability to navigate the new technology, instructional components, or system data required to put in place and the follow up on the personalized plan.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

CCS presents an unevenly detailed plan to improve learning. The "flipped instructional delivery" personalizes the learning environment by putting initial lesson review and learning in student hands by providing students with vodcasts that give them flexible access to their lessons, and structuring more opportunity for individual student follow-up in class. CCS describes the approach that took place in the high school implementation with the goal of "shifting students from the passive role of receiving information to the active role of being responsible for their own learning." The application cites increased student interest and motivation and other promising results from initial implementation, but does not detail how this plan has worked or might work for individual students and groups of students at different ages, and having differing needs, abilities and capacities to engage as intended outside of school.

CCS provides an good description of how teachers work with students in class to personalize learning, by using enhanced technology to assess a student's needs and performance to identify appropriate activities, level of materials and next steps. This will allow teachers to work with students with a range of abilities and disabilities.

CCS does not clearly explain the structure and operation of the Instructional Management System (IMS) that will provide and integrate "a variety of data stored in disparate locations" for educational decision making.

CCS describes a process to align instruction to Common Core State Standards that State is beginning to implement, but does not speak to the content of those standards and how they will promote college and career readiness. Teachers will receive training to develop the aligned curriculum and materials, but the proposal does not adequately detail how and by whom.

The plan for career exposure and exploration is limited, generally proposing career exploration exercises to apply academic skills in different mock career situations, and noting that "vodcasts from real working professions will be a great addition." It is unclear whether opportunities to allow students to explore their interests outside of school are feasible or were considered.

CCS does not identify a plan component to address diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives that goes beyond the in-class discussion and collaborative work the "fosters improved social skills and a respectful understanding of different cultures and diverse perspectives.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

7

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CCS presents a multi-faceted but inadequately detailed approach to prepare and engage educators in the initiative and improve the teaching and leading that support student learning and progress toward college and career readiness. CCS importantly notes that it aims "to create a culture in which ALL see themselves as learners." The district will expand School Leadership Teams to include teacher and parent representation that will help broaden perspectives and distribute leadership to carry out the project.

A number of activities are described but not well connected. The project will train teachers in the "flipped instructional delivery" model and in the technology and tools needed to engage and work with students in personalized learning environments. The project plan provides limited description on the elements. CCS will utilize teachers having experience with the model as well as external trainers and specialists to provide the relevant professional development. The proposal and roll-out schedule give sketchy information on how that will actually take place (in particular, determining and securing effective external trainers; the extent of assigning existing experienced teachers for extensive mentoring while they have continuing teaching requirements; scope and plan for product development and data technology vendors).

The plan notes that teacher Professional Learning Communities will be responsible for aligning instruction to the new common core standards, but does not explain diffidently how the educators will be prepared to accomplish that task initially and to update materials in the various formats required by the project, and for the multiple school levels that will be participating. While teams will review and critique vodcasts and other materials, the plan does not anticipate refreshing them -- a step a dynamic personalized plan might well involve.

In Pre-K-8 expansion schools, the project plans to work with Model teachers and have them open their classrooms for observation. The plan does not lay out how those teachers will be identified, the reasons for having their classrooms observed for this particular project, or the training and professional development they will receive to be effective using the model.

CCS questions its existing model to assesses teacher effectiveness, cites new tools in development by outside resource groups, but does not as yet have an adequate effectiveness assessment plan in place or scheduled.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The CCS plan describes an infrastructure that does not have several significant supports to implement the project. The project itself will fall under central office oversight by the CCS superintendent and will have a director of "flipped" learning, proposed to tap the principal of the high school where the model was initiated. CCS provides a letter of support from the local teachers' association, but not similar indication of support from other stakeholders. A community school in particular relies on the engagement of all members. CCS identifies in general terms the roles and responsibilities for administrators, teacher, students and parents that represent a mix of activities and aspirations. It is also uncertain whether students at the various grade level will have the ability and capacity at home to engage in the personalized learning as desired.

CCS states that each school will have autonomy and flexibility through project expanded School Leadership Teams to change school schedules, school personnel and staffing, but also notes that those changes require Superintendent or board approval.

The Mastery Learning Model and related activities to engage, instruct and assess students through "Flipped" personalized instruction supports student achieving mastery at different paces, but their ability to earn credit outside of standard assessment periods in not clear.

The model has a design that makes practices adaptable and accessible, as demonstrated by the experience of high school students in the initial implementation.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The infrastructure is inadequately prepared for all schools and educators to support personalized learning.</p> <p>While CCS teachers will tailor instructional follow-up and supports to students in class after their vodcast review outside of school, the capacity of students at the various grade levels to effectively participate in the "Flipped" model of instructional delivery outside of class remains uncertain. Students, teachers and parents will have access to materials and assessments through personalized portals, but the effectiveness of the mechanisms (vodcast and technical assistance) developed for teachers and students to learn how to use the technology also is unclear.</p> <p>Limitations in the schools' infrastructure are not detailed other than the need for wireless upgrades. CCS does explain the need for and its plan to put in place an interoperable system to connect new and existing data, but the systems to be connected and their relationship to the project are not specified.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCS outlines a general approach for continuous improvement, and the plans components and measures are vague or inadequate.</p> <p>CCS focuses this discussion on monitoring and analyzing different levels of data to assess whether the project is meeting its goals, but with limited reference to personalized student learning and how the project demonstrates improvements or requires correction. Secure data displays provide timely information to the individual student, parents, teachers, collaborating teams of educators, principals and administrators to evaluate progress and make improvements. The project is designed with regularly scheduled opportunities for those discussions.</p> <p>CCS does not currently have an adequate mechanism to assess teacher effectiveness. The district expects to have one in place by 2014-2015.</p> <p>The CCS has a website but does not specify how it will publicly share information on the project's investment or provide timely feedback.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCS provides a clear internal organizational structure describing the teams that will guide and engage in the continuous improvement process (teacher teams, school advisory committee, school leadership team, district advisory team, and district leadership team). The description further identifies team members, their functions and how often they will meet to address continuous improvement. The district does not discuss the process of engaging external stakeholders, although representatives from partner organization may sit on the advisory committees, and the Clintondale High School has at least two external partners, a health clinic and a Michigan University tutoring program that provide services to students in the school.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCS describes 12 performance measures and the rationale for selecting each. The lack of information and questions about several measures do not provide confidence in several measures:</p> <p>The proposal does not describe how young children will participate in the project effectively. That requires more clarity overall before indicators and assessments are determined.</p>		

CCS also does not offer response to the included State review that raises questions about the accuracy and appropriateness of several performance measures and the data used.

CCS has concluded that its current teacher evaluation program is inadequate and has not as yet adopted a new system. The district is in the process of awaiting a new system that is being piloted and plans to have it operational 2014-2015,

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The CCS project design provides a good opportunity to improve student achievement through an innovative personalized approach to instructional delivery. The district has structured the project to allow some greater autonomy and flexibility at the level of the school, although exactly how much is unclear, given that changes have to be approved by the superintendent and/or board. CCS mentions changes to the configuration of the budget, school calendar and schedules among possible reforms.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCS presents a budget that identifies all funds that will support the project, describes in detail the significant one-time investment for building the systems technology infrastructure, provides a rationale for investments across specific components that are explained with varying clarity and sufficiency.</p> <p>The budget presentation and alignment raise questions about adequacy for training of teachers and other instructional staff, in terms of how many and how long trainers will be needed, as well as the related duration and intensity of teacher training, possible refreshers and ongoing support. All teachers in the elementary and middle schools will require training to understand and implement the model approach, as well as training to use the technology (including new systems and the interoperable interface). It is also not clear if training will need to differ for teachers of the youngest children from training that teachers in the upper grades might receive.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCS presents sustainability plan that has many challenges.</p> <p>Most of the costs will occur up front in the project -- the one-time technology infrastructure upgrade, vodcast and other materials development, and teacher trainings. Continuing to meet project goals and support a variety of project-related activities will have costs after the grant period. CCS will continue to support the project through general revenue, Title I/ESEA, and corporate and foundation contributions. The district identifies corporate partners that helped support initial implementation and it expects that support to continue, although specific commitments are not provided. CCS indicates that training costs will drop, but does not adequately take into account some continuing need for vodcast development and replenishment, new teacher training and refreshers, support for identified improvements, etc.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCS proposes an approach with a strong evidence base that aims to make the school the hub for community activities and provide public and private resources to support needed services to the members of the school district's community</p> <p>The district has a number of partnerships already in place or in process. Clintondale High School has an on-site Health Center that offers "various medical and mental health services, which are tailored for each site." Online tutoring and mentoring is</p>		

also provided by students from Michigan University. Parents and families who might use the school clinic will learn about the district's preschool program, as well as ways to promote healthy growth and development. CCS describes a relevant set of desired results and indicators that will be measured, including that children will receive services that reduce absences and promote attention to instruction, and that discipline incidents will decrease.

CCS aims to identify additional partners to support the preschool, elementary, and middle schools as they embrace the FLIP model, although specific candidates or categories are not identified. Representatives of these entities will join the District Advisory Committee to expand the stakeholders who will bring new and different perspectives and take ownership in supporting student improvement.

The CCS has solid experience with this approach, which itself reflects a focus on personalized attention and services. The CCS project will link and strengthen these partnerships with the schools, all of which are slated by the project to improve student engagement and personalized learning.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant meets the absolute priority on the basis of the "Flipped" personalized instructional delivery model that drives all activity in the project. This is demonstrated in the proposed technology upgrades that will increase availability and access to data to measure and track individual student progress; earlier interventions with students to improve their trajectory for successful achievement with the inclusion of pre-k, elementary and middle schools; the engagement of teachers with individual students via vodcasts and in-classroom activities; the changing efforts to assess teach effectiveness that will relate to individual students and instruction; and the goals and strategies to improve the performance of schools that have had poor records.

Total	210	91
-------	-----	----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	1

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

CCS provides an optional budget supplement that would support the replication of the FLIP model through the establishment of a national training center and a learning management system that "supports Pre-K-12 flipped learning." Flipped instruction is an innovative and exciting concept and the district is commended for its desire to spread the word. However, establishment of a national center for replication is premature, especially given the still early developmental nature of the model and its implementation and expansion in CCS. The optional budget and plan do not identify the LEA entities or broader constellation of groups with which CCS would work to replicate. The remaining budget cannot be evaluated.

Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0503MI-3 for Clintondale Community Schools



A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant's plan is both comprehensive and coherent. The goals are clear, ambitious and specific and addresses the four core educational reforms. Strategies for instructional delivery are provided at the High School level to accomplish the plan's goal's of expanding their efforts to all grade levels ,however a specific strategy to move forward to accomplish this expansion is not evident. . The Applicant cited conditions that justified the need of the plan based on : 1. Many families in the participating school's communities are struggling econonically which impact students learning, 2. The high school has been notified by Michigan's Department of Education that the school is on Michigan's Persistently Lowest Achieving List, 3. A lack of a positive flow of learning from the classroom to the home and back to the school, 4. Traditional classroom learning practices needing to be replaced with value-added activities such as personalized learning, active learning and differentiation., 5. At- Risk population has increased and 68% to 82% of students in their schools are identified as at-risk for school failure. . The Applicant provided evidence of developing a delivery model to all of the district's students through Flipping Learning : Instruction Personalized (FLIP). The FLIP Plan is designed to increase student achievement by increasing the effectiveness of teachers and leaders through data-driven instructional methods to prepare students for college-career ready Common Core Standards and for college and career ready graduation. The FLIP Plan is outlined and explained in the applicant's plan. . The Applicant provided evidence of the FLIP Plan goals : 1. increasing student achievement , 2. decreasing achievement gaps, 3. measuring,monitoring and increasing educator's effectiveness, 4. preparing and supporting personalized learning environments, 5. expanding parent involment. Each of the goals are addressed by an action plan, activities, deliverables and responsible parties. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The applicant provided an approach in implementing the FLIP Plan by providing direct digital instruction delivered by teachers that will allow srudents to view their work on prior assignments. Teachers will make lesson presentations at the beginning of class for students who do not have access to a computer at home. The plan's approach in implementing it's goals also will also include establishing a culture of using data to inform instruction. . The Applicant provided a FLIP Roll Out Table in the appendix of the plan which outlined how the plan will scale up the FLIP Model Plan while expanding and strenghtening the model at the high school level. The plan's goals, timelines, activities, rationale and responsible parties for implementing the plan are evident in the applicant's plan. 		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant presented evidence of a design for scaling up the plan which is outlined in the FLIP Roll Out Model. but did not provide evidence of how the plan's reformed services will be scaled to support district-wide reform change beyond the participating schools. 		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant presented evidence of the plan's goals for improved student outcomes presented in the plan's Flipping 		

Learning : Instruction Personalized Table. The goals are clear and are aligned with priorities of the plan.

. The Applicant described it's Performance Measures on summative assessments that will use disaggregated baseline data at each grade level, goal areas and subgroups to determine proficiency status and the plan's growth.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: <p>. . The Applicant provided evidence of a clear record of success during 2009-2011 of increasing ninth grade student failure rate in the Core courses. A table is provided reflecting the reduced failure rate of students. The Applicant cites the reason for this change was due to their school's FLIPPED Learning Model which provide classroom time structured activities that develops students deeper learning and understanding and with resources made available to their at-risk students. Another reason cited for the change is due to the use of an instructional model with content being digitally crested and viewed prior to class by students through the internet.</p> <p>. The Applicant provided evidence of the district' success of increasing equity among students in all subgroups in the content areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics from Spring 2011-Spring 2012. A table is provided reflecting Michigan's Merit Exam of Student Proficiency Rate by subgroup which included their students with Disabilities and students who are Economic Disadvantaged.</p> <p>. The Applicant provided evidence of the participating school's reduction in discipline incidents(from 731 incidents to 187 incidents), and reduction in parent complaint calls and an increase in graduation rates (8%) over the last two years.</p> <p>. The Applicant did not provide evidence of a proces used of making student performance data available to students, educators and parents that inform and improve participation, instruction and services and data did not address the different development levels of the students.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: <p>. The Applicant provided evidence of the use of their plan's website which enables stakeholders to obtain informal data regarding actual personnel salaries at school level for all school instructional and support staff, actual school level for teachers and actual non-personnel expenditures at the schools</p> <p>. The Applicant did not provide evidence of a high level of transparency in their school's processes, practices and investments to include a description of the extent that the district has made available their school level expenditures to stakeholders without the ownership of a computer.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: <p>. The Applicant has not provided clear evidence of autonomy under State's legal statory for the support of the plan's personalized learning environment. The school district has given their high school principal sufficient autonomy to make changes in the high school, awaiver was obtained to keep the principal in place but it is not clear if the waiver is currently in place.</p> <p>. The Applicant cited evidence that the plan aligns with the Michigan Department of Education's plans to transition to the Common Core State Standards and to implement new Educator Effectiveness Systems for Teachers, Principals and the Superintendent which is outlined in the plan's appendix.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		

- . The Applicant identified stakeholders's participation but did not provide stakeholder participation in the development of the plan or how the plan was revised based on their engagement and feedback.
- . The Applicant provided evidence of various means used to engage their stakeholders in the plan's implementation: 1. Community members will become aware of the plan's successes through media. 2. Teachers use of web-based intervention tools by creating a library of vodcast to support their instruction, 3. Parents will view daily vodcast with their child to ascertain what and how their child is learning., 4. School Leadership Teams will be expanded and District Advisory Committees formed to meet quartly to monitor the plan's progress and compare performance target's growths.
- . The Applicant provided evidence of letter of support from elementary teachers and the President of the Teachers Union.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant identified the needs and gaps that the plan will address which are: 1. Educators need additional training (leadership training and professional development) to successfully personalized instruction, 2. Technology systems need to be upgraded in order to connect and maintain all information, content and collaboration services to provide a personalized learning environment for students and support for educators to grow professionally, 3.Student early screening assessments to determine learning gaps, 4. Classrooms needing to be provided with furnishing that allow smooth transitions between individual, pair and small group work, 5. need to purchase whiteboards and projectors.
- . The Applicant provided a detailed analysis of the school district's Gaps and Needs Plan which addresses the plan's needs and gaps current status, their proposed solutions, deliverables, timelines and responsible parties.

to successfully personalized instruction)

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	20
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence in implementing strategies for all articpating students to accelerate their learning aligned to college and career ready standards and college ready graduation requirements. . The Applicant provided evidence that the plan will implement various approaches to their instructional strategies to enable students to pursue a rigorous course of study for college and career standards. The apporaches include : 1. Delivering content through the use of diginal screen capture, 2. ////teachers providing weekly on-line assessments to educators and parents to monitor students progress toward meeting their goals, 3. Teachers receiving training in the common Core State Standards 4. Implementing an Instructional Management System that will combine data analysis, balanced assessment, standard-aligned curriculum, response to intervention and developing educator"s management in a single intuitive interface system to improve educational decision making for all grade levels in the district, 5. Parents will able to watch vodcast to better understand what their child is learning. . The Applicant provided evidence of ongoing and regular feedback being provided for students that will lead to success in school and readiness to college and careers. Students will meet with teachers to receive feedback regarding their formative assessments. Parent portals wll provide timely frddback and teachers will use the formative assessment teacher's professional development content. 		

- . The Applicant's plan includes supportive inclusive environments for Students with Special Needs. Individual and group settings for inclusive instruction will be provided by classroom teachers, special education teachers and aides to meet the special needs of the students to graduate on time and are ready for college and careers.
- . Participating students will be provided mentors from the University of Michigan to further develop the student's personalized goals and aspirations to attend college

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided evidence of a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by creating a coaching environment for continuous growth. Principals will receive coaching to identify indicators of the Common Core State Standards and personalized learning. Teachers will work together to examine student assessment data and instructional strategies and will receive training and coaching using a variety of technology tools to personalized learning and in creating a learning environment for students.
- . The Applicant provided evidence of School Leadership Teams being developed at each participating school to include teachers, and parent representation whose responsibility will be to monitor the plan's progress through monthly analysis of each school's formative and summative assessments.
- . The Applicant provided a Principal and Teacher Continuous Improvement Plan which outlined the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties for increasing highly effective principals and teachers. A table is provided in the plan that address Principal and Teacher Continuous Improvement.
- . The Applicant provided evidence of the plan's goal to provide training and support for teachers through teacher professional engagement, however, the Applicant did not address how to keep teachers's teaching practices refreshed and up to date to better improve instruction for all students.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence of the school district's structure in the governance of the plan's development. Students, parents, teachers, and leaders will have specific rules that require adaption of policies, practices and rules to support personalized learning. . The Applicant provided evidence of flexibility and autonomy being provided with the establishment of the School Leadership Team at each participating school in addressing schedules, school personnel staffing, school level budgets and responsibilities of educators with approval of the Superintendent or the School board. . The Applicant provided evidence of resources and instructional strategies that will address Students With Disabilities and English Language Learners. . The Applicant did not provide evidence of students receiving opportunities to earn credit based on demonstration of mastery of standards multiple times multiple comparable ways. 		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- . The Applicant provided evidence that all stakeholders have access to content, tools and learning resources to support the plan. Training will be provided to stakeholders in the use the equipment and technology to accelerate student learning,

- . The Applicant provided evidence that personalized role-base portals will be designed to provide easy and secure access for parents, students, teachers and principals. The portals will be linked to other web-based software.
- . The Applicant provided evidence of upgrading and intergrating their technology systems to be truly interoperable. An Instructional Improvement System will be developed to ensure access to comprehensive student information linked to student current and historical performances, discipline data, attendance data, teachers notes and response to intervention.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence of implementing a continuous improvement process by creating organizational structures so that data is monitored, analyzed and timely acted upon and to ensure that stakeholders analyze deeply into student achievement data to monitor student progress and determine strategies for continuous improvement. Evidence was not provided showing how to distribute information out to all stakeholders regarding the plan's development and its investments. . The Applicant described and identified the organizational structure's data levels which are : 1. Individual student level data , 2. Classroom level data, 3. Grade level/Content area data, 4. School level data, 5. District level data, 6. Educator effectiveness data level. Each of the data levels addresses approaches to continuously improve the plan. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant evidence of implementing strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with all stakeholders which be fostered through the plan's organizational structure by bringing a variety of stakeholders committed to continuous improvement and expanding use of portals to suppor the plan's goal of expanding parent involvement. . The Applicant provided evidence of an interoperable data system . The Applicant provided evidence of the School District's Continuous Improvement Organization Structure Chart which outlined district's and school's team structure, leaders, and monthly meetings. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence of achievable performance measures by over all and subgroups, with annual targets for required applicant-proposed performance measures during and after the funding of the plan. . The Applicant did not provide sufficient evidence of how the performance measures will be reviewed and improved over time if it is insufficient to guage the plan's implementation progress and did not provide rationale for the performance measures. 		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence of how the effectiveness of the plan will be evaluated to improve results. The evaluaton will be aligned to the goals and performance measures in the plan. . Evaluaton forms and surveys will be provided to all stakeholders by the Director of the plan to determine the effectiveness of the plan's program. . The applicant did not provide evidence of timely feedback being provided to stakeholders of the evaluation data summarized. 		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided a reasonable and cost effective budget to support the implementation of the plan.. A narrative budget was presented which identified funds that will support the plan's rationale for investments, priorities and the plan's reasonable and sufficient requested funding support. Evidence was provided for grant funding support during and after the funding period. . The Applicant provided thoughtful rationale for the use of the plan's funding to support personalized learning environment and provided evidence that the grant funding should support the plan during the funding period however the Applicant did not provide enough information and rationale in the budget's training components. 		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence that the plan will be sustained and scaled by expanding partnerships possible grant sources to provide continuous funding. . The Applicant developed a Project Sustain Plan for their community schools that will focus on development training for leaders, teachers, students and parents. The Project's Sustain Plan includes the grant's currently funded sources in place, the continued funded needed and possible funding sources. 		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . The Applicant provided evidence of providing sustainable partnerships with parents and families and the communities. The focus will be on rebuilding the school's and district's communities by offering space and facilities on their sites. A Health Center is presently based at their high school and offers services to students and parents . The Applicant provided evidence of developing a strategy to scale the plan beyond the participating schools by identifying additional partnerships to support the schools in addressing parents need of community services.. . The Applicant provided evidence of the plan's desired results to draw parent with infants to their schools and combine with partnerships parents can receive physical exams, treatment and information regarding their child's developmental growth targets. . The Applicant provided evidence increasing parent involvement by identifying parents and community representatives to join School and district Advisory Committees and to build staff capacity of teachers and leaders in assessing the needs and strengths of their students and develop closer connection with parents to become active participants in their child's education. . The Applicant provided Competitive Preference Priority Performance Measures that were addressed in (E)(3) section of their plan 		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: <p>The plan shows evidence of how the participating schools will build on the core educational assurance areas to improve</p>		

learning and teaching through personalization of strategies, tool, support of students and educators and the alignment with college-career readystandards and graduation requirements. The plan addresses ccelerating student achievement, deeoening student learning, and increasing the effectiveness of educators. The plan showed evidence to decrease the achievement gaps across student groups and increasing rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	168
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	15

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

. The Applicant provided a cost effect budget developed to support the replication of their FLIP Plan. A detailed description of how these fund will be used is provided. The budget is reasonable and allows for the plan's Community Schools to serve as a model for change to other teachers, schools and districts wishing to implement the FLIP Learning Plan